DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 244 651 JC 830 510

AUTHOR Rosenwasser, Marie
TITLE Faculty Renewal, Basic Learning Skills, and Student Success: An Overlooked Relationship?
PUB DATE 83
NOTE 27p.; Paper presented at the Annual Conference of the Community College Humanities Association (San Francisco, CA, November 17-20, 1983).
PUB TYPE Reports - Descriptive (141) -- Viewpoints (120) -- Speeches/Conference Papers (150)

EDRS PRICE MF01/PC02 Plus Postage.
DESCRIPTORS *Academic Achievement; *Basic Skills; College Faculty; Community Colleges; *Educational Objectives; *Faculty Development; Humanities; Interdisciplinary Approach; Student Needs; Teacher Attitudes; Two Year Colleges
IDENTIFIERS *North Seattle Community College WA; *Writing Across the Curriculum

ABSTRACT

Examples of programs and activities at North Seattle Community College (NSCC) are used to support the argument that there is an important relationship among faculty renewal, student success, and basic learning skills that should be strengthened and promoted. First, underpinning assumptions are put forth regarding faculty renewal and faculty development, public priorities in education, the leading position of the humanities in renewal activities, and misplaced efforts in faculty development. The next sections highlight NSCC activities demonstrating the relationship among faculty renewal, student success, and basic skills, including: (1) participation in the Washington State "Revitalizing the Humanities Project"; (2) development of a writing across the curriculum project; (3) a survey of faculty regarding their assessment of students' thinking, writing, and study skills; and (4) a more formal faculty survey to identify sources of concern and frustration regarding student skills. Finally, additional reasons for tying students' success in basic learning skills with faculty renewal are provided, focusing on the national clamor for educational quality and concerns about financial support. Appended materials include copies of the faculty survey instruments, and a report to the faculty about student problems and needs based on the second survey. (HB)

****
* Reproductions supplied by EDRS are the best that can be made *
* from the original document. *
****

ED244651

FACULTY RENEWAL, BASIC LEARNING SKILLS, and STUDENT SUCCESS: AN OVERLOOKED RELATIONSHIP?

by

Marie Rosenwasser, Ph.D.
Humanities Division
North Seattle Community College
9600 College Way North
Seattle, WA 98103

1983 Community College Humanities Association Conference
San Francisco, California

JC 830 510

"PERMISSION TO REPRODUCE THIS MATERIAL HAS BEEN GRANTED BY

M. Rosenwasser

TO THE EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)."

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION
NATIONAL INSTITUTE OF EDUCATION
EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)

☐ This document has been reproduced as received from the person or organization originating it.

☒ Minor changes have been made to improve reproduction quality.

• Points of view or opinions stated in this document do not necessarily represent official NIE position or policy.

INTRODUCTION

Visualize with me situations in which you have found yourself when you as a teacher or administrator have felt revitalized in your work? If you teach in the performing arts, are you visualizing you and your students in a successful concert hearing applause? Are you nearing the third act of the best show you and your drama students have produced? Are you watching students receive their diplomas? Are you in class or your office reading students' tests and papers and smiling because they have comprehended what you taught and communicated clearly what they now know? Now visualize your situation when you are experiencing a kind of lasting frustration and feeling of failure. Are you in class listening to students stumble through grossly inadequate answers to comprehension questions for your course or watching them perform miserably in a speech? Are you reading exams and papers that make you wonder if you and your students have been in the same class this quarter? If in these visualizations you saw yourself relating to student performance which relates to their competency or incompetency in the fundamental learning skills of reasoning, writing, speaking, listening or reading perhaps you believe as I do that the kind of faculty renewal which is lasting is that which gets student success; and maybe you agree with me that there is a strong correlation between students' success and their competency in the learning skills. If you do not agree, indulge me for the next few minutes while I elaborate on my conviction that there is an important relationship among faculty renewal, student success and basic learning skills that should be strengthened and promoted in our divisions and on our campuses and within our professional associations.

Before I tell you the NSCC story of how and why I came to believe this, I should identify some of my relevant assumptions. They are: 1) faculty renewal and student success are natural results to relate to each other, and they are the kinds of goals that no institution or association can afford to ignore; 2) yet, obvious as this statement is, these two goals are not the primary, driving forces in college's missions, association's conferences, or granting agencie's goals; instead we see the public's demands and the curriculum's needs take precedence so that faculty renewal and student success receive only indirect attention while satisfying the public's need for training in the high technology fields receiving institutions direct attention; 3) while faculty development and renewal are not synonomous, there is a relationship yet faculty development funds are spent without long-- range planning relating to renewal which results in piecemeal development for some faculty and nets less renewal than might otherwise be realized; 4) neither the need for renewal nor higher student success is isolated with humanities faculty, but humanities faculty are in the enviable position of leading the campuses in the kinds of activities that can be most renewing--cross curricular for the faculty and skill building for students; and 5) despite our best intentions, our efforts at faculty development are both too trendy and temporary when we ought to be creating and supporting those efforts which have been identified as the traditional necessities of being educated--i.e. competency in the learning skills and enduring in nature. Generally, it is based on my 20 plus years as a teacher or administrator at six colleges, during which time I have both needed renewal and been a student of the phenomenon, that I have reached these conclusions. Specifically, it is my experience as chairman of the Humanities Division, Director of Adult Education and Coordinator of Developmental Education at North Seattle that has forced me to analyze our faculty development efforts and observe carefully how the highest renewal seems to be achieved.

Consider for a moment two major reasons why institutions are concerned about faculty development, instructional effectiveness and student failure. Why is faculty renewal so important in community colleges and to those of us in the humanities? Because there are so few opportunities for faculty to teach the academically inclined and because the substance of the humanities is not immediately obvious to the superficial learner. What is more wearing to a teacher than to try quarter after quarter to get students to comprehend and appreciate such ideas as idealism and rationalism and such authors as Shakespeare and Faulkner when students don't want to read more than their daily newspaper? Recall how defeated you have felt when you have been brave enough to have students share their lecture notes with you. If you haven't taught them how to summarize, their notes will include words you put on the board and as many unimportant as important details; their notes are not likely to include the ideas you have discussed. This kind of defeat can be replaced with a feeling of success if you have taught students how to paraphrase daily and weekly lectures into one paragraph or one page summaries. What a feeling of accomplishment I have had with my adult high schools speech students (students already known for their failure syndrome) when I could get them beyond the useless lecture notes they scribbled and even beyond their sentences about what they did in class yesterday to short paragraphs about what they now know about some aspect of effective oral communication. That feeling of success is so strong that I am renewed--even as I teach this evening class at the end of a ten hour day.

As I tell you the NSCC story I promised, I think you will see the relationship renewal and success and hope you will find parallels to your own campus. When I came to North Seattle 4 1/2 years ago, there was neither a writing across the curriculum effort or an ESL program; there was a survey of students' reading levels which showed that as many as 30% didn't read at the college level. There was also a lot of grumbling by individual faculty and chairmen in divisions other than Humanities that Humanities ought to do something about the ESL students who were making life difficult for vocational, business, and social science instructors and why didn't we explain our developmental English curriculum (i.e. the only basic skills courses on campus) so people could understand it. Some of the criticism was justified, so being typically guilt ridden, accommodating humanists led by a chairman (myself) on whom one could rest attributes such as feelings of frustration for students' general inability to handle English and inability of the English department to explain its program clearly, we in Humanities proceeded to establish an ESL curriculum, improve both our pre-college English program and the way we explained and promoted it. You will not be surprised to learn that improving one curriculum, developing another curriculum, and creating a better brochure did not silence those who liked asking "why can't we solve the ESL problem?" or "how come students don't read my economics text well without my help even after they have passed developmental reading courses?" Nor did our efforts lead to the kind of faculty development that goes beyond acquiring information and problem solving to what I view as really morale boosting and energizing---i.e. faculty renewal.

At the same time we in the Humanities Division were implementing the objectives and activities of the NEH funded Washington State "Revitalizing the Humanities Project" by undertaking such efforts as promoting the humanities among vocational faculty and chairmen, forming an advisory council, and creating an introductory, interdisciplinary humanities course that sought to develop students' basic learning skills by instructing in both those skills and the humanities content. Efforts to increase dialogue with vocational faculty met with limited success; the advisory council has been a catalyst for sustaining and lifting morale even in grim days of budget cuts and threats of

RIF; but it was the incorporation of specific instruction in thinking and communication skills in the introductory humanities class that realized both the highest student success and helped generate a sense of revitalization among the faculty. We had a sense of energy, excitement, fun, and satisfaction from doing that course and realizing that student success which I had not seen through any other division or campus activity.

While we were implementing the Revitalizing Humanities Project, Humanities faculty--particularly in English--were becoming even more educated in writing across the curriculum and learning theory; they were experiencing success in applying what they were learning from journals, conferences, and conversations with colleagues. Because people like Rita Phipps, who was one of the leaders of this conference's pre-conference workshops on teaching reading across the curriculum and Marcia Barton, who is one of this conference's presenters on writing across the curriculum became revitalized; they were willing and eager to share this enthusiasm with their colleagues. So they led workshops on organizing courses, sequencing assignments to parallel how students learn, and on developing writing assignments in content courses that would assist students in learning the content more successfully.

The September, 1982 week-long writing across the curriculum workshop with faculty from art, speech, engineering, health sciences, and psychology led by Marcia Barton with short guest spots from our reading instructor and myself stands out as a striking example of the sense of energy and renewal that come from faculty sharing and solving instructional problems by sharing and improving basic learning skills assignments in courses they teach. Follow-up discussion with the faculty and some of the students in their classes showed that while both faculty and students were adjusting to the idea of writing journals in physics and summaries in art history, they both felt positive about doing so. Among the faculty both during this workshop and in division affairs since then, I have noticed more conversation and willingness to cooperate on projects beyond their own discipline. It was, for example, the speech instructor from this workshop who readily agreed to talk about his experiences with the learning skills assignments in his various speech communication classes for the all-faculty convocation (preceding fall quarter) this September. It is the art faculty from that 1982 workshop who are working with the most revitalized English faculty in writing an NEH grant--another example of cross-disciplinary communication and work that did not exist prior to the development of an interdisciplinary humanities course or our writing across the curriculum efforts. While both our interdisciplinary humanities course and writing across the curriculum projects were "sold" because we thought we needed to catch up; their more lasting effects have been faculty renewal both because of the group process and better results with the students. When students are taught how to paraphrase and summarize and then required to write daily or weekly summaries in speech, art history, or psychology classes, teachers of these classes are rewarded by being able actually to see student comprehension; and student discussion is more literate because students have been taught organizing skills for oral messages Both teachers and students feel and see more happiness and success with the classes. As one teacher put it, "Students come closer to my expectations of expressing themselves more fully with more maturity." We know that teachers of drama, music, and art and faculty in vocational programs have always had more observable data through which they can measure student success. Think how restorative it is to the drama teacher to hear the applause and watch her students execute a difficult scene well or how much excitement your music colleagues feel when their students perform in concert successfully or how readily your campus and community give publicity to the successful vocational programs where students are pictured rebuilding engines or wiring a computer successfully. In fact,

if you think about it, faculty in almost every area other than the humanities and social sciences have more easily demonstratable, observable student success. While students' learning skills need to be strengthened for reasons other than faculty and administrator egos, the ego is where any revitalization rests.

The case for relating basic learning skills, faculty renewal and student success is strengthened when one examines faculty response to questions about what skills they find wanting in their students. We learned answers to this question in two ways at North Seattle. As part of a 1980 all-college event known as President's Day, we polled the faculty with the instrument you see at the top of your packet, tabulated responses during the lunch hour and discussed results with the faculty in afternoon sessions. We used the fact that faculty said students' thinking, writing, and study skills were weak to initiate writing across the curriculum. In winter, 1983, as part of my responsibilities as Coordinator of Developmental Education, we surveyed faculty more formally with the questionnaire you see as the second item in your packet. Despite the addition of a small ESL curriculum, an improved developmental English program, and better communication with the campus about help available for students with inadequate writing and reading skills, both vocational and academic faculty still listed problems with studying, writing, thinking, reading, listening, and speaking as the problems their students experience which cause them the greatest concern and frustration. We shared those results with the faculty in the third item you have in your packet--my report to the faculty which I summarized in a President's Day presentation this past September. If you look at the last two pages of the report, you see me urging the faculty to incorporate assignments that develop the basic learning skills into their courses; for as I pointed out with 25-35% of our students entering NSCC with reading skills below college level and writing skills below ENG 101 and with budget constraints limiting the number of developmental reading and writing courses, and with a mission statement reaffirming open access, comprehensiveness, and excellence in both vocational training and academic transfer programs, there is possibly no other intelligent response to the frustration we can feel as we pit these realities of underprepared students, open access and excellence, limited funds and a stationery work force against one another but for every instructor, division chairman, and dean to share in the responsibility for developing students' learning skills and in reaping the rewards of the student success that can follow.

Unfortunately, we do not respond this way, we seem to fight the skills problems of our students, as Dr. K. Pat Cross observed in a recent address to Seattle Community College administrators, one of the reasons for low faculty morale and high frustration among community college faculty is that we have never accepted the true implications of open access. I see much evidence not only at my own college but those throughout the state to support her observation. If you work with colleagues who on the one hand are showing increasing signs of weariness teaching class after class of introductory to students less and less prepared and on the other hand showing increasing frustration over the pressure to graduate students who are seen as examples of excellence in public education, look to your personal and campus response to students' basic learning skills and faculty renewal.

Tying students' success in basic learning skills with faculty renewal at this time seems sound for several reasons. First, just the national clamor over educational quality is making all of us in education "testy." We want student success and we are embarrassed that at what should be mid-point or the maturity of long, rewarding careers we have to defend what we are doing. So some of us blame secondary schools, parents, and t.v.; others stubbornly set

higher entrance standards on their courses, still others clench their fists and demand better performance from our students. All of this stress fosters neither job satisfaction, effective instruction, or creativity. While these conditions are not really as new to community college faculty and administrators as the current clamor over the deterioration of American education might lead one to believe, the conditions seem more intense; hence the need for faculty renewal is even greater. So I am suggesting that we grab these rascals of student failure and faculty burn-out by their tails and turn them against themselves so that the failure is replaced by success and the burn-out by energy and a sense of "I can and should continue to teach for the next 10 years!"

Helping faculty analyze their texts, tests, lectures, and assignments in order to incorporate instruction in the fundamental skills of critical thinking, communication, and studying takes money. Here is another reason why faculty renewal, student success and skills have to be tied. Money goes where success is found and priorities are the highest. Faculty development funds are now quite well institutionalized. Why? Because good things come from faculty getting paid to improve their courses and meeting with colleagues to learn new ways to help students with learning disabilities, incorporate the latest findings in whole brain research or conducting a seminar in Russian history and Soviet realities. Administrators and boards of trustees recognize that without decent faculty morale, the college's image and programs suffer, so even in years of tight budgets, faculty development funds and curriculum development support are maintained or even increased.

A few years ago, many colleges were smart enough to capture FIPSE or NEH funds to help them initiate writing across the curriculum efforts. Unfortunatley, grant support for basic skills projects on individual campuses appears to be declining because to quote a FIPSE staff member "We're interested in funding more innovative projects that join campuses and go beyond individual courses." To that I replied "That's too bad since among Washington community colleges, I don't think there are four of us who have viable writing across the curriculum programs." She was surprised at my response for she thought the two FIPSE and NEH projects Washington had would have taken care of the writing across the curriculum need. How they could have is unclear since neither grant had such a specific purpose. But by their very nature foundations and granting agencies apparently have to fund that which is more unique and expect institutions to fund these essentials. Grant recipients have to claim fantastically far-reaching effects of their innovative ideas. That seems to be in the nature of granting and receiving, yet we know that institutions are as likely to fund that which sells--e.g. high technology--as they are basic skills across the curriculum and the goals of one or two grants will as likely get totally institutionalized across several campuses as all your students will arrive on your campus next quarter reading and writing at a college level. So we look to foundations and endowments and in an effort to be competitive for these limited funds, we become very flexible. Consequently, we have this system of one year promoting interdisciplinary humanities and another writing across the curriculum and another right brain/left brain theory and critical thinking skills. None of these efforts is misdirected; all will probably net some faculty renewal and more student success. But how much more effective we might be both in our professional associations such as CCHA and on our individual campuses if we organized all faculty and curriculum development around the highest, strongest goals---student success and faculty satisfaction--and the most universally inclusive need--improvement in basic learning skills. Getting administration and faculty to face the challenge and accept the responsibility of improving their students' thinking and communication skills is an institutional and

professional goal that should exist for at least the next two decades. Renewal will occur in proportion to the realization of this goal. We would do well to remember that as we plan conferences, set grant guidelines, and devise annual plans for faculty development. The constancy we experience in this need should be met with the same constancy in our professional response. Every new direction we take should be related to what we have just done. We should sift and sort through the experiments and accomplishments more carefully so that the best of what we are doing is added to the new direction we are about to travel. We should not be talking about critical thinking skills without remembering what we already know about writing across the curriculum; and we would do better to incorporate all the learning skills in our cross--curricular efforts than to focus only on writing. Maybe we are at a point professionally to devote a conference to this sifting, sorting and summarizing.

So when we think about allocating funds for faculty and administrator development and organizing staff development programs, I think the organizing stasis--as Aristotle taught--should be student success rather than faculty or administrator improvement. While student success implies instructional effectiveness, possibly instructional improvement, using student success as the organizing goal has several advantages. First, it places the responsibility for learning, and succeeding where it belongs--on the students' shoulders as well as the faculty and administration. Secondly, student success is something everyone has to be for; while instructional improvement implies that only certain teachers and certain programs need that while the rest of us will continue with our already nearly perfect methods and courses. Our experiences with some division chairmen and faculty taught us that some people get defensive over suggestions that students' basic learning skills should be strengthened in every course and will ask "what's wrong with the courses and the way we're teaching now?" Thirdly, student success rewards, motivates, and even demands more creative teaching. Rewards and creativity beget faculty renewal. But if we are really to capitalize on an inherent relationship between renewal and student success, we must organize more sustained and enduring efforts across campuses, professional associations and granting agencies around improving and strengthening students' learning skills--for the degree of success students experience with their skills in our colleges can determine the extent to which we their teachers are renewed.

Survey of Instructional Problems

Instructions: Read each item and place an X by each statement that accurately describes a significant number of students in your typical class.

Circle the ten items that you find most difficult to overcome in instruction.

Please add any items that you can think of that the questionnaire may have omitted.

1. Students cannot accurately summarize an assigned reading, lecture, or demonstration.
2. Students cannot state the most important points of an assigned reading, lecture, or demonstration.
3. Students cannot write an acceptable lab or field report.
4. Students cannot define important terms in their own words.
5. Students lack the vocabulary to understand regular instructional materials.
6. Students do not support the statements they make with evidence or details.
7. Students have trouble recognizing a definition or concept when it is presented in different words.
8. Students do not regularly use the dictionary or other ordinary reference materials.
9. Students have trouble observing accurately and recording their observations in clear, descriptive language.
10. Students do not recognize logical fallacies.
11. Students have trouble making connections between new information and what they have already studied.
12. Students have trouble concentrating and paying attention during an entire class period.
13. Students cannot decide whether the reasons offered in support of a statement actually support the statement.
14. Students seem to learn information or processes long enough to be tested and then forget the material.
15. Students cannot spell as well as they should.
16. Even when they have successfully completed the prerequisite courses, students seem not to build their skills sequentially. They seem to "forget" what they learned last quarter.
17. Students seem unable to analyze and evaluate the steps that lead to a conclusion.
18. Students cannot write correct sentences.
19. Students cannot stick to the subject in giving reports or writing papers.
20. Students cannot organize their ideas coherently.
21. Students cannot focus on one topic and develop it.
22. Students do not spend enough time on projects - the first version is likely to be the only version.
23. Students cannot punctuate for clarity.
24. Students may retain key words or several points from a reading or demonstration but are unable to state how those words or points are related.
25. Students assume that everyone shares their values and beliefs.
26. Students say that they "know" the material they study but "can't say it" or "can't write it."
27. Students do not know how to state a reasonable conclusion drawn from their observations.
28. Students have trouble separating personal ideas and attitudes from factual statements.
29. Students cannot describe a process.
30. Students do not know how to write research papers.
31. Students do not know how to use the library.
32. Students do not know how to take an active role in learning.
33. Students cannot reduce an idea to its most concise form.
34. Students fear failure too much to try to apply what they know.
35. Students are suspicious of questions that lack absolute answers.
36. Students do not seem really to "want" an education.

Your Additions:

37.

38.

39.

40.

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

NEEDS OF DEVELOPMENTAL STUDENTS AT NSCC--A QUESTIONNAIRE

(Prepared and distributed by members of the Developmental Education Advisory Committee.)

APRIL 1983

Dear Colleagues:

Here is an opportunity to tell us how many of your students need help in basic writing, speaking, listening, arithmetic and other college survival skills in order to succeed in your classes. This completed questionnaire (and optional follow-up interview) will help us assess the needs of students and make decisions as to what to do with existing resources to meet these needs. We also want to learn your reactions to possible courses of action this committee may recommend.

Please complete and return this questionnaire to your DEAC representative, Lucy Charnley, by APRIL 15, 1983.

Thank you for time well spent!

QUESTIONNAIRE

1. What portion of the students in your classes have obvious problems in basic COMMUNICATION SKILLS in the average quarter?

Course	No. Enrolled	Portion with Problems
A) _____	_____	approx. [ ] 1/4 [ ] 1/2 [ ] 3/4
B) _____	_____	approx. [ ] 1/4 [ ] 1/2 [ ] 3/4
C) _____	_____	approx. [ ] 1/4 [ ] 1/2 [ ] 3/4
D) _____	_____	approx. [ ] 1/4 [ ] 1/2 [ ] 3/4

2. What portion of the students in your classes have obvious problems in basic ARITHMETIC SKILLS in the average quarter?

Course	No. Enrolled	Portion with Problems
A) _____	_____	approx. [ ] 1/4 [ ] 1/2 [ ] 3/4
B) _____	_____	approx. [ ] 1/4 [ ] 1/2 [ ] 3/4
C) _____	_____	approx. [ ] 1/4 [ ] 1/2 [ ] 3/4
D) _____	_____	approx. [ ] 1/4 [ ] 1/2 [ ] 3/4

3. In which areas are the greatest problems that your students experience? Rate each by circling the appropriate number on the right. (1 = no problem; 5 = serious problem)

Problem Area	serious problem				no problem	don't know
a) reading	5	4	3	2	1	0
b) writing	5	4	3	2	1	0
c) speaking	5	4	3	2	1	0
d) listening	5	4	3	2	1	0
e) thinking	5	4	3	2	1	0
Arithmetic:						
f) whole numbers	5	4	3	2	1	0
g) fractions	5	4	3	2	1	0
h) decimals	5	4	3	2	1	0
i) percents	5	4	3	2	1	0
j) elementary algebra	5	4	3	2	1	0
k) interpretation of graphic data	5	4	3	2	1	0
Personal problems:						
l) financial problems	5	4	3	2	1	0
m) inter-personal relations	5	4	3	2	1	0
n) motivation	5	4	3	2	1	0
o) self-confidence	5	4	3	2	1	0
p) study skills (time management, test taking, note taking)	5	4	3	2	1	0
q) other:_____	5	4	3	2	1	0

4. Is there an English proficiency requirement for your non-English classes?

a) [ ] YES
If yes, which courses and requirements?

(1) course(s):_____

(2) requirements: a] CELT score of _____
b] DAT score of _____
c] English placement test score _____
d] completion of course: _____
e] other: _____

b) [ ] NO
If no, should there be one?
(1) [ ] yes; if yes, list requirement/course: _____
(2) [ ] no
(3) [ ] don't know

c) [ ] DON'T KNOW

5. Is there an arithmetic proficiency requirement for your non-math classes?

a) [ ] YES
If yes, which courses and requirements?

(1) course(s): _____

(2) requirements: a] DAT score of _____
b] completion of course: _____
c] other: _____

b) [ ] NO
If no, should there be one?
(1) [ ] yes; If yes, list requirement/course: _____
(2) [ ] no
(3) [ ] don't know

c) [ ] DON'T KNOW

6. Rate the following items to reflect your perception of the needs for developmental education at NSCC. (1 = no need; 5 = greatest need)

Need:	greatest need				no need	don't know
...more pre-college English classes	5	4	3	2	1	0
...more pre-college math classes	5	4	3	2	1	0
...more English as a Second Language classes	5	4	3	2	1	0
...formal intake and advising system for developmental students	5	4	3	2	1	0
...proficiency requirements in English for entrance into vocational and academic programs	5	4	3	2	1	0
...proficiency requirements in math for entrance into vocational and academic programs	5	4	3	2	1	0
...a learning center (physical facility) for developmental education	5	4	3	2	1	0
...more time spent in developmental classes (i.e., one English class is often not enough to prepare for success in academic classes)	5	4	3	2	1	0
...more counseling opportunities for students with personal problems	5	4	3	2	1	0
...more financial aid for developmental students	5	4	3	2	1	0
...other: _____	5	4	3	2	1	0

7. Concerning physically disabled students in your classes, what do you perceive to be the greatest needs? (1 = no need; 5 = greatest need)

Need:	greatest need				no need	don't know
...clear guidelines for what instructors must do to help physically handicapped students	5	4	3	2	1	0
...more intake, placement and advising opportunities for physically disabled students	5	4	3	2	1	0
...aides to assist students in classes	5	4	3	2	1	0
...more counseling opportunities for physically disabled students	5	4	3	2	1	0
...correction of inadequacies in physical plant (i.e., nature of classroom and furniture) to accommodate physically disabled students	5	4	3	2	1	0
...other: _____	5	4	3	2	1	0

THANK YOU FOR YOUR HELP IN COMPLETING THIS QUESTIONNAIRE. WE WILL PUBLISH THE RESULTS AND MAKE DECISIONS BASED ON THIS INPUT AND THE INPUT WE GATHER WHEN INTERVIEWING SEVERAL OF YOU. IF YOU WOULD LIKE TO BE INTERVIEWED BY A MEMBER OF THE DEVELOPMENTAL EDUCATION ADVISORY COMMITTEE, PLEASE INDICATE BELOW BY SUPPLYING THE FOLLOWING INFORMATION:

Name _____ Office Phone: _____

Best time to reach you _____ Mailstop: _____

NOTES: The Developmental Education Advisory Committee is chaired by Dr. Marie Rosenwasser and has committee members representing every division. This group of faculty and administrators has been assigned the task of continuing the work begun by two earlier committees in order to advise the Coordinator of Developmental Education in her tasks of assessing today's needs for developmental education on our campus, developing a plan for developmental education and helping all of us serve the students in our classrooms. Committee membership is:

Lucy Charnley
Dale Chase
Carol Hamilton
Ruth Paige
Rita Phipps
Barbara Poole
Vicky Ringen
Anne Sangston
Clara Smith
Nancy Snyder
Marilyn Stark
Don Trimble
Betty Welsh

PE
3/10/83

A REPORT TO THE FACULTY
ABOUT PROBLEMS AND NEEDS OF NSCC STUDENTS

RESULTS OF DEAC QUESTIONNAIRE

WRITTEN BY

MARIE ROSENWASSER

WITH

TABULATION OF RESULTS

BY

DALE CHASE

AUGUST, 1983

NORTH SEATTLE COMMUNITY COLLEGE

WHAT IS IN THIS REPORT?

This is a report on the results of the DEAC (Developmental Education Advisory Committee) questionnaire which was distributed to all faculty in April, 1983. The focus of this report will be on faculty responses to the questions concerning the greatest problems that NSCC students experience in their classes and the perceptions faculty have about the needs of developmental education at NSCC. In addition, responses concerning physically disabled students will be reported. Sixty eight faculty completed the survey; thus you are reading the perceptions of the majority of the full-time faculty concerning students' needs and possible courses of action for developmental education at NSCC.

WHAT ARE THE GREATEST PROBLEMS THAT YOUR STUDENTS EXPERIENCE?

According to the frequency of response, the biggest problems of NSCC students in order of largest to smallest as perceived in this study are: study skills, writing, thinking, self-confidence, and reading.

Using the response averages for a ranking of problems reveals a ranking of: writing, study skills, thinking, reading, listening, and self-confidence. IT IS IMPORTANT TO NOTE THAT YOU THE CAMPUS FACULTY FIND SERICUS OR ALMOST SERIOUS PROBLEMS IN YOUR STUDENTS' ABILITIES TO WRITE, STUDY, AND THINK. THESE ARE THE TOP THREE PROBLEMS ACROSS THE CAMPUS AS REVEALED IN THESE RESULTS. (See Table A.)[1]

DO ACADEMIC, VOCATIONAL, AND NON-INSTRUCTIONAL FACULTY DIFFER IN THEIR PERCEPTIONS OF STUDENTS PROBLEMS?

Again, problems with writing, studying, and thinking were among those skills most frequently identified by academic faculty as problems for students. The addition by the academic faculty was the identification of poor listening as a problem; perhaps this is because there are many courses in the academic program where the lecture mode dominates. (Table B.)

Vocational faculty most frequently identified study skills as a problem for students, but tied with that was writing; following writing were thinking, reading, and listening. (Table C) Again, the problems are similiar to those perceived by the academic faculty; however, it is important to note that writing was as much a concern as study skills for vocational faculty. One may not necessarily have predicted that both the vocational and academic faculty would have identified problems in writing as high a concern as it is.

The average scores for the vocational faculty clustered around "Moderate Problems: (3 on a scale of 1-5) slightly more than did the average score of the academic faculty; this may be because there were higher averages for problems in the mathematics area for the vocational faculty or it may be because vocational faculty see students' problems in reading, writing, thinking, and studying as a concern but simply not as high a concern as the academic faculty.

[1] Tables begin on page 7

On frequency of response, the non-instructional faculty (librarians and counselors) agreed with the academic and vocational faculty in identifying problems in studying and writing as highest concern; however, self-confidence seems to receive higher concern by the non-instructional faculty (Table D).

The non-instructional faculty see writing and thinking as "Almost Serious" problems for an average score of 3.56. Self-confidence received a 2.89 average while reading a 2.44 average. The non-instructional faculty see financial problems and speaking problems of equal seriousness.

DO RESULTS DIFFER FROM DIVISION TO DIVISION?

An examination of the results for each division is interesting; one finds that more faculty in a division such as Humanities are concerned about problems in writing than is true for a division such as Health Medical. One also finds, however, that a division such as Engineering Technologies identifies problems in writing as a high concern. Below is listed each division with the ranking of perceptions of problems seen as "Serious" and "Almost Serious." The rankings begin with the highest number of responses in those two categories and go to the fifth highest.

Business and Commerce:	Thinking, writing, study skills, reading, percents.
Home and Family:	Studying, writing, reading (because the N is so small, there is no clear pattern for determining the fourth and fifth items and all three of the previously mentioned items received 2 responses in the "Almost Serious" category).
Counseling:	Study skills, self-confidence, writing (because there was such a small response, it is impossible to identify further problems).
Engineering Technologies:	Writing, speaking, elementary algebra, study skills, reading, listening.
Health Medical:	Study skills, financial problems (because it was a small N, there were no other clear major items).
Humanities:	Writing, study skills, self-confidence, reading, listening, thinking, motivation.
LRC:	Reading, writing, study skills all tied for first place.
Science and Math:	Percents, thinking, and tied for third place were listening, fractions, interpreting graphic data, study skills and motivation.
Social Sciences:	Writing, study skills (all other responses too small to indicate a clear pattern).

There are some differences, then, in how faculty in the various divisions perceive the problems students have. One would expect that faculty teaching classes in math would indicate a greater concern for problems relating to basic arithmetic skills. A somewhat surprising result is that faculty in reading-intensive areas such as Social Sciences and Humanities do not list reading as the most serious problem. However, it should be remembered that these are perceptions of problems and that problems students have in study skills and writing may be related to reading. Analysis of the results of the Stanford Reading Test which has been given to students who are seeking to enter English classes fall, 1983 will show the percent who score at stanines below the level acceptable for college reading. Those results plus the results of the Student Assessment System pilot project in fall and winter will give us more information about entering students' reading levels.

HOW DO FACULTY PERCEIVE THE NEEDS FOR DEVELOPMENTAL EDUCATION AT NSCC?

Analysis of the frequency of response on the perceived needs for developmental education at NSCC shows that by combining "Greatest Need" and "Almost Greatest Need", the faculty most frequently say that there needs to be proficiency requirements for English for entrance into vocational and academic programs; the second most frequent response was a need for a formal intake and advising system for developmental students; the third was for more English as a Second Language classes; the fourth was for more pre-college English classes; and the fifth was for more time spent in developmental classes, i.e. one English class is often not enough to prepare for success in academic classes.

The top five needs as demonstrated by the average response are as follows: proficiency requirements in Engish for entrance into vocational and academic programs, formal intake and advising system for developmental students, more English as a Second Language classes, more pre-college English classes, and more time spent in developmental classes. A close sixth highest need is more counseling opportunities for students with personal problems. It is worth noting that the most frequent response and the highest average, "Proficiency Requirements in English for Entrance into Vocational and Academic Programs," received a 3.54 or a response of "Almost Greatest Need", but most of the top five needs averaged about 3 or "Moderate Need." (Table E)

DO ACADEMIC, VOCATIONAL AND NON-INSTRUCTIONAL FACULTY DIFFER IN THEIR PERCEPTIONS OF NEEDS FOR DEVELOPMENTAL EDUCATION AT NSCC?

As with the total campus response, the academic faculty perceived a need for more proficiency requirements for English, an advising and intake system, more ESL classes, and more pre-college English classes among the top five needs. The unique result is that more counseling for developmental students was identified as among the top five needs by the academic faculty. Again, English proficiency requirements for entrance into classes received the highest average score of 3.81 with a need for a formal intake and advising system receiving 3.39. The need for more counseling for developmental students received the third highest average score of 2.77, and more ESL classes was the fourth with an average response of 2.68. (Table G)

A unique difference for the vocational faculty is that they included proficiency requirements in math for entrance into vocational and academic programs among the top five whereas the total campus and academic response did not indicate that. The top six needs as perceived by the vocational faculty, in order, include: proficiency requirements in English for entrance into vocational and academic programs, proficiency requirements in math for entrance into vocational and academic programs, more ESL classes, more pre-college English classes, more time spent in developmental classes, and a formal intake and advising system for developmental students. When the averages are examined, however, a different ranking occurs. While a need for English proficiency requirements for entrance into vocational classes seems to be the most important need with a need for math proficiency requirements identified as the second highest need, the third highest need is that of more ESL classes while the fourth is more pre-college English classes. A formal intake and advising system is the fifth highest need. The average response clusters closer to 3 or that of a "Moderate Need." (Table G)

The most serious needs as perceived by the counselors and librarians are those of needing more pre-college English and math classes. Following closely are the needs of pre-college ESL, a formal intake and advising system, and more proficiency requirements in English and math, more time in developmental classes and more counseling for developmental students. (Table H)

DO RESULTS DIFFER FROM DIVISION TO DIVISION

Faculty within various divisions do differ on their ranking of the needs. Table I shows rankings of the top five needs by division. Often items tied for the same ranking, so ties are indicated with an asterick.

By division the rankings of the top three needs were:

Business and Commerce:	Proficiency requirements in English, more ESL classes, more pre-college math classes
Counseling:	More pre-college math classes, more pre-college English classes, formal intake and advising system
Engineering Technologies:	More pre-college English classes, more pre-college math, more pre-college ESL
Health Medical:	Proficiency requirements in math, formal intake and advising, proficiency requirements in English.
Home and Family:	More time in developmental classes, a learning center.
Humanities:	Proficiency requirements in English, formal intake and advising system, more ESL classes.
IRC:	More ESL classes, more pre-college English, more pre-college math.
Science and Math:	More pre-college math, proficiency requirements in math, proficiency requirements in English.
Social Sciences:	Proficiency requirements in English, formal intake and advising system, more ESL

WHAT ARE THE PERCEIVED NEEDS OF PHYSICALLY DISABLED STUDENTS?

The campus faculty perceive the greatest need concerning physically disabled students in their classes to be a need for clear guidelines of what instructors must do to help physically handicapped students; the second greatest need is for aides to assist students in the classes; the third highest need is more intake, placement, and advising opportunities for physically disabled students. An analysis of the division responses shows that the divisions mirror the general campus responses except that the Social Sciences, Counseling, and Engineering divisions see a slightly higher need for intake, placement, and advising opportunities than for aides to assist the students in class.

IN SUMMARY, WHAT ARE THE RESULTS?

Sixty eight faculty from all divisions responded to the survey. While there were some differences among the academic, vocational, and non-instructional responses, there were more similarities than differences.

Five Highest Perceived Problems of NSCC Students

First:	Inadequate study skills
Second:	Poor writing skills
Third:	Weak thinking skills
Fourth:	Low self-confidence
Fifth:	Poor reading skills

Five Greatest Needs for Developmental Education at NSCC

First:	Need proficiency requirements in English for entry into academic and vocational classes.
Second:	Need a formal intake and advising system.
Third:	Need more ESL classes.
Fourth:	Need more developmental English classes.
Fifth:	Students need to spend more time in developmental classes, (i.e. one English class is not enough).

WHAT ARE WE DOING ABOUT THESE PERCEIVED NEEDS AND PROBLEMS?

Through efforts of the Developmental Education Advisory Committee, faculty, SCCD Faculty Development, the instructional divisions, Student Services, and individual faculty, there are several things that we are doing in reponse to these needs.

1. In order to begin a formal intake advising, assessment and placement system for our students, we are implementing the Student Assessment System for a pilot group of students fall quarter and a second pilot for new students winter quarter; these two pilot projects will help us learn more about the competencies, goals and problems of incoming students and it will allow us to test and improve an intake, assessment and advising process that we hope to implement fall, 1984. You will be receiving more information about this system and the results from Ruth Paige, Director of Counseling, and your DEAC committee members.

2. We have begun faculty workshops on writing across the curriculum under the faculty leadership of Marcia Barton and the support of Faculty Development and conducted two seminars for faculty from various division; now Marcia Barton and Carol Hamilton are working on a curriculum grant to prepare materials for the basic learning skills which can be applied across the curriculum. Under the leadership of DEAC, we will work to expand our efforts in writing across the curriculum to basic learning skills across the curriculum. You will have opportunities to participate in these workshops and to contribute your own experiences with successfully reinforcing students' learning skills while learning the content of your courses.

3. We are offering more classes for ESL students fall quarter and throughout 1983-84 than we did in 1982-83; by allocating more resources to ESL students and by your sending us names of ESL students in your classes who do not have sufficient language skills to succeed in your courses, we can continue to improve our service to ESL students. For the first time, ESL students whose names are on waiting lists for Engineering Technologies programs are receiving a letter encouraging them to enroll in the apporpriate ESL class while they wait for admission into their chosen program.

4. We have improved the ESL and pre-college English curriculum by creating ten hour intensive classes for students at certain levels and by specifying more precisely the entry and exit skills for students in each of the ESL or pre-college English classes. You can strengthen this improvement by referring students to the Loft or the Humanities Division who have problems with some aspect of using English.

These are some of the more obvious activities that are occuring and will continue to occur. Throughout the year you will receive reports on these projects and announcements of in-service workshops. But it is each of us who needs to further the development of students' learning skills, regardless of the class. All of us who teach need to refer students who need counsleing to the counseling center, who need math work to the math lab, who need work in English and ESL to the Loft.

Through this questionaire, you the faculty have spoken in considerable agreement about what are the problems and needs concerning developmental education at NSCC. While this questionnaire did not measure the relative importance of these "developmental needs" it is worth noting that consistent with national trends, we at NSCC are recognizing the need for student competency in basic learning skills. What can only be inferred from this questionnaire, however, is our readiness to help teach students the needed skills. These results might suggest that we believe by setting more and higher entrance requirements into classes students will need no reinformcement in the basic skills. Experience across the nation suggests this to be untrue. It is a challenge to all of us to create and implement instructional methods across the curriculum that develop and reinforce students' basic learning skills.

TABLE A: FREQUENCY AND AVERAGE RESPONSE FOR TOTAL CAMPUS PERCEPTION OF PROBLEMS STUDENTS EXPERIENCE

N = 68

Problem Area	Average Response	Serious Problem 5	Almost Serious Problem 4	Moderate Problem 3	Almost No Problem 2	No Problem 1	Don't Know 0
Reading	2.75	10	13	19	13	2	11
Writing	3.46	14	29	12	6	1	6
Speaking	2.43	7	8	17	19	9	8
Listening	2.68	8	16	16	11	8	9
Thinking	2.92	12	17	18	6	5	10
Whole Numbers	.75	1	0	8	3	16	40
Fractions	1.62	7	8	8	8	3	34
Decimals	1.59	9	6	9	4	4	36
Percents	1.85	14	6	6	6	2	34
Elementary Algebra	1.54	11	4	10	1	2	40
Interpretation of Graphic Data	1.7	8	8	6	4	2	40
Financial Problems	1.98	9	8	14	8	0	29
Interpersonal Relations	1.7	1	8	21	5	6	27
Motivation	2.32	3	17	17	8	8	15
Self-Confidence	2.59	10	17	14	7	2	18
Study Skills (time management, test taking, note taking.)	3.34	19	24	9	4	1	11

TABLE B: FREQUENCY OF RESPONSE FOR ACADEMIC FACULTY PERCEPTIONS OF PROBLEMS STUDENTS EXPERIENCE

N = 31

Problem Area	Average Response	Serious Problem 5	Almost Serious Problem 4	Moderate Problem 3	Almost No Problem 2	No Problem 1	Don't Know 0
Reading	2.55	4	5	9	5	2	6
Writing	3.51	9	11	5	2	1	3
Speaking	2.1	3	3	4	10	6	5
Listening	2.8	5	7	9	2	5	3
Thinking	3.03	7	7	9	0	4	4
Whole Numbers	.52	0	0	3	2	3	23
Fractions	1.35	4	4	1	1	1	20
Decimals	1.06	3	3	1	1	1	22
Percents	1.48	7	2	0	1	1	20
Elementary Algebra	2.23	3	1	2	0	2	23
Interpretation of Graphic Data	1.45	4	4	2	1	1	19
Financial Problems	1.61	4	3	4	3	0	17
Interpersonal Relations	1.55	0	3	8	5	2	13
Motivation	2.45	1	10	8	1	5	6
Self-Confidence	2.68	4	10	6	2	1	8
Study Skills (time management, test taking, note taking.)	3.19	8	11	4	1	1	6

TABLE C: FREQUENCY AND AVERAGE RESPONSE FOR VOCATONAL FACULTY PERCEPTIONS OF PROBLEMS STUDENTS EXPERIENCE

N = 28

Problem Area	Average Response	Serious Problem 5	Almost Serious Problem 4	Moderate Problem 3	Almost No Problem 2	No Problem 1	Don't Know 0
Reading	3.07	4	8	8	5	0	3
Writing	3.36	3	14	5	4	0	2
Speaking	2.82	4	4	11	4	2	3
Listening	2.64	3	7	6	6	1	5
Thinking	3.01	5	9	6	3	1	4
Whole Numbers	1.04	1	0	4	1	10	12
Fractions	1.96	2	4	5	6	2	9
Decimals	2.21	5	2	7	3	2	9
Percents	2.32	6	2	6	4	1	9
Elementary Algebra	2.25	7	2	6	1	0	12
Interpretation of Graphic Data	1.57	3	3	4	2	1	15
Financial Problems	2.28	4	4	8	2	0	10
Interpersonal Relations	1.78	1	3	10	0	3	11
Motivation	2.21	2	4	7	6	3	6
Self-Confidence	2.39	3	5	7	5	1	7
Study Skills (time management, test taking, note taking.)	3.43	7	10	5	3	0	3

TABLE D: FREQUENCY AND AVERAGE RESPONSE FOR NON-INSTRUCTIONAL FACULTY PERCEPTIONS OF PROBLEMS STUDENTS EXPERIENCE

N = 9

Problem Area	Average Response	Serious Problem 5	Almost Serious Problem 4	Moderate Problem 3	Almost No Problem 2	No Problem 1	Don't Know 0
Reading	2.44	2	0	2	3	0	2
Writing	3.56	2	4	2	0	0	1
Speaking	2.33	0	1	2	5	1	0
Listening	2.11	0	2	1	3	2	1
Thinking	2.11	0	1	3	3	0	2
Whole Numbers	.67	0	0	1	0	3	5
Fractions	1.44	1	0	2	1	0	5
Decimals	1.44	1	1	1	0	1	5
Percents	1.67	1	2	0	1	0	5
Elementary Algebra	1.67	1	1	2	0	0	5
Interpretation of Graphic Data	1.22	1	1	0	1	0	6
Financial Problems	2.33	1	1	2	3	0	2
Interpersonal Relations	2.0	0	2	3	0	1	3
Motivation	2.22	0	3	2	1	0	3
Self-Confidence	2.89	3	2	1	0	0	3
Study Skills (time management, test taking, note taking.)	3.56	4	3	0	0	2	

TABLE E: FREQUENCY AND AVERAGE RESPONSES OF TOTAL CAMPUS PERCEPTION OF NEEDS FOR DEVELOPMENTAL EDUCATION AT NSCC

N=68

	Average Response	Greatest Need 5	Almost Greatest Need 4	Moderate Need 3	Almost No Need 2	No Need 1	Don't Know 0
More Pre-College English Classes	2.87	17	18	9	4	3	17
More Pre-College Math Classes	1.93	12	11	4	5	5	31
More ESL Classes	2.99	24	12	9	3	2	18
Formal Intake & Advising System for Develop. Students	3.13	24	15	9	2	2	16
Proficiency Require. in English for Entrance into Voc. & Academic Programs	3.54	26	21	8	1	1	11
Proficiency Require. in Math for Entrance into Voc. & Academic Programs	2.5	18	13	8	1	2	26
A Learning Center (physical facility) for Develop. Ed.	.97	8	10	12	5	8	25
More Time Spent in Develop. Classes (i.e. 1 Eng. class is often not enough for success in academic classes)	2.63	16	16	6	6	5	19
More Counseling Opportunities for Students with Personal Problems	2.52	9	15	14	11	3	16
More Financial Aid for Develop. Students	1.66	6	7	10	10	5	30

TABLE G: FREQUENCY AND AVERAGE RESPONSE FOR VOCATIONAL PERCEPTION OF NEEDS FOR DEVELOPMENTAL EDUCATION

N= 28

	Average Response	Greatest Need 5	Almost Greatest Need 4	Moderate Need 3	Almost No Need 2	No Need 1	Don't Know 0
More Pre-College English Classes	2.96	10	5	4	0	1	8
More Pre-College Math Classes	2.04						
More ESL Classes	3.07						
Formal Intake & Advising System for Develop. Students	2.68	8	5	4	1	1	9
Proficiency Require. in English for Entrance into Voc. & Academic Programs	3.39	13	5	3	0	1	6
Proficiency Require. in Math for Entrance into Voc. & Academic Programs	3.14	11	5	3	1	2	6
A Learning Center (physical facility) for Develop. Ed.	1.86	3	4	6	0	3	12
More Time Spent in Develop. Classes (i.e. 1 Eng. class is often not enough for success in academic classes)	2.60	8	6	2	0	3	9
More Counseling Opportunities for Students with Personal Problems	1.89	1	3	9	4	1	10
More Financial Aid for Develop. Students	2.	4	2	7	3	1	11

TABLE H: FREQUENCY AND AVERAGE RESPONSE FOR NON-INSTRUCTIONAL FACULTY OF PERCEIVED NEEDS FOR DEVELOPMENTAL EDUCATION

N= 9

	Average Response	Greatest Need 5	Almost Greatest Need 4	Moderate Need 3	Almost No Need 2	No Need 1	Don't Know 0
More Pre-College English Classes	3.89	1	6	2	0	0	0
More Pre-College Math Classes	3.67	2	5	1	0	0	1
More ESL Classes	3.68	4	2	2	0	0	1
Formal Intake & Advising System for Develop. Students	3.67	3	3	2	0	0	1
Proficiency Require. in English for Entrance into Voc. & Academic Programs	3.11	1	5	1	0	0	2
Proficiency Require. in Math for Entrance into Voc. & Academic Programs	3.11	1	5	1	0	0	2
A Learning Center (physical facility) for Develop. Ed.	3.11	1	3	3	1	0	1
More Time Spent in Develop. Classes (i.e. 1 Eng. class is often not enough for success in academic classes)	3.44	2	4	1	1	0	1
More Counseling Opportunities for Students with Personal Problems	3.67	4	2	1	1	0	1
More Financial Aid for Develop. Students	2.67	1	4	0	1	1	2

JUL 6 1984

ERIC Clearinghouse for Junior Colleges
8118 Math-Sciences Building
University of California
Los Angeles, California 90024